

Serial No.: 09/829,361

REMARKS

Claims 6 is pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. ADVISORY ACTION

The comments presented below in Section II were presented originally in Applicants' response filed on July 26, 2004. In the Advisory Action mailed September 30, 2004, the Examiner indicated that the comments did not place the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner indicated that Saeki et al. teaches transport stream data not only in the context of a transmission media as the applicant suggests but also for information storage media like optical discs as recited in claim 6 (citing Saeki et al., Col. 29, Ins. 28-39).

Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner is overlooking the express teachings of Saeki et al. The very same text in Saeki et al. that the Examiner cites in fact supports the applicants' portrayal of the deficiencies in Saeki et al.

Transport stream data, as expressly noted in the present application, refers to a multi-stream composed of a plurality of MPEG streams in such a manner that the images of different "angles" are contained in respectively different streams. (See, e.g., Spec., Page 25, Lines 4-11). In Saeki et al., the discussion of transport stream data is limited to use of transmission media such as telephone lines, Internet, LAN, and satellite broadcasting as previously argued by applicants. (See e.g., Column 29, Lines 28-39, reproduced and commented upon below). This interpretation is further supported by Saeki et al. in the discussion at Column 29, Lines 40-48. Specifically, when referring to transport stream data, Saeki et al. describes the reproduction apparatus as having a reception unit for receiving the transport stream (other system stream).

In other words, Saeki et al. does not describe transport stream data recorded on the recording medium. Instead, Saeki et al. describes the reproduction apparatus as having a reception unit for receiving the other system stream to be multiplexed in with

Serial No.: 09/829,361

the data recorded on the recording medium in order to form the transport stream. (See, e.g., Col. 29, lines 40-48).

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIM 6 UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

Claim 6 now stands rejected under 35 USC §102(e) based on *Saeki et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 6 defines a *recording medium* on which *transport stream data* has been recorded. The transport stream data includes menu item coordinate information, image information and valid duration information which has been recorded on the recording medium.

The Examiner refers to Column 29, Lines 28-39 of *Saeki et al.* as teaching transport stream data as recited in amended Claim 6. Specifically, *Saeki et al.* states:

The media do not necessarily have to be information storage media like optical discs. So long as image information and its control information can be interleaved into the medium, the media may be wireless transmission media like broadcasting or wired transmission media like a communication line. Here, examples of the transmission media are telephone lines, Internet, LAN, and satellite broadcasting. As the video objects of the present embodiment are a type of MPEG data called "system stream", in the case of the above mentioned transmission media, the video object will be transferred as transport stream into which the system streams are multiplexed. Id. (Emphasis Added).

As noted in the above passage from *Saeki et al.*, the reference may teach transferring data as a transport stream (i.e., "the video object will be transferred as transport stream"). However, *Saeki et al.* teaches utilizing transport stream data only in the context of a transmission media (i.e., "in the case of the above mentioned transmission media). *Saeki et al.* does not teach or suggest transport stream data for a recording medium as recited in claim 6.

In other words, *Saeki et al.* discloses an information storage media in the form of an optical disk. However, *Saeki et al.* does not teach or suggest utilizing transport stream data in connection with the optical disk. Rather, *Saeki et al.* teaches utilizing

Serial No.: 09/829,361

transport stream data in the case where the media is a transmission medium as opposed to a recording medium such as an optical disk.

For at least the above reason, *Saeki et al.* does not teach or suggest a recording medium having each and every feature as recited in claim 6. Therefore, the rejection of claim 6 is improper and should be withdrawn.

III. CONCLUSION

Accordingly, claim 6 is believed to be allowable and the application is believed to be in condition for allowance. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should a petition for an extension of time be necessary for the timely reply to the outstanding Office Action (or if such a petition has been made and an additional extension is necessary), petition is hereby made and the Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees (including additional claim fees) to Deposit Account No. 18-0988.

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP


Mark D. Saralino
Registration No. 34,243

DATE: October 25, 2004

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
C:\GENYAMA\yamap572a.rceamd.wpd